

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,806	07/31/2003	James F. Stewart	PAT 537AW-2 US	9776
	7590 03/07/2007 NER GERVAIS LLP		EXAMINER	
WORLD EXCHANGE PLAZA 100 QUEEN STREET SUITE 1100 OTTAWA, ON K1P 1J9 CANADA PRYOR, ALTON N ART UNIT			PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·				
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MON	NTHS	03/07/2007	PAP	PER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Columnson	10/630,806	STEWART ET AL.	STEWART ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Alton N. Pryor	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	ress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESTRUCTION OF THE MAILING DESTRUCTION OF THE MODERN OF THE MAILING DESTRUCTION	DATE OF THIS COMMUN .136(a). In no event, however, may d will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mode te, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed DNTHS from the mailing date of this com ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 L	December 2006.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is action is non-final.					
· 	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.	•					
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-3,5 and 6</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a ☐ accepted or b ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documer		A (° (° b)				
2. Certified copies of the priority documer						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		en received in this National S	tage			
application from the International Burea	•	- 4 1 d				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	it of the certified copies no	ot received.				
Attachment(s)	A	v Cummon (DTO 440)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice o	f Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

Application/Control Number: 10/630,806 Page 2

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

I. Rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Agbaje,
Atwater, and Roberts will not be maintained in light of amendment filed 12/12/06.
Agbaje's herbicide composition is in the form of a suspoemulsion comprising both an oily and aqueous phrase, whereas Robert's teaches a herbicide composition in homogenous form. Applicant is correct in that the combination of references is inappropriate.

II. New Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3,5,6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malhota (USPN 5202205; 4/13/93). Malhota suggests a transparencies comprising metal halide or urea antistatic layer comprising blends of antistatic plasticizers such as phosphate esters (column 10 lines 7-65 preferably lines 23-25, 61, column 12 preferably lines 53, column 16 lines 10-38, preferably line 38), ethoxylated tallow amines (column 12 lines 1-47 preferably lines 44-47, column 13 line 26 – column 14 line 3 preferably lines 2-3), and urea sulfate (column 10 line 37 – column 11 line 3, preferably line 3, column 13 lines 27-39, preferably line 39. Malhota does not exemplify in an example a combination of phosphate esters, ethoxylated tallow amines and urea sulfate. It would

Art Unit: 1616

have been obvious to one having ordinary in the art to formulate a formulation (antistatic layer) comprising phosphate esters, ethoxylated tallow amines and urea sulfate. One would have been motivated to do this because the art suggests the combination. With respect to the amounts of ingredients, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been expected to determine the optimum amount. One would have been motivated to do this in order to develop a layer with good antistatic quality. In a claim to a composition a statement to the composition's intended use has no patentable significance.

Claim Objection

Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not teach or suggest a layer comprising the ingredients and their amounts recited in claim 4.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 571-272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 4

Alton Pryor

Primary Examiner

AU 1616